**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached replacement drawing sheets include changes to FIGS. 1, 2, 4, 6 and 9 which have been amended to include descriptive text for the "Drive Circuit" and Evaluation Circuit".

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the indication that claim 7 contains allowable subjected matter. The Drawings have been amended. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination, with claim 1 being in independent form. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

### Overview of the Office Action

The Office Action Summary (Form PTOL-326) fails to provide a check mark to indicate that the formal drawings filed on June 8, 2004 were objected to by the Examiner. However, the November 18, 2005 Office Action (pg. 2) indicates that the drawings were objected to for failure to provide descriptive text in Figs. 1, 2, 6 and 9. In addition, the June 7, 2006 Office Action (pg. 5) indicates that Applicants have failed to submit amended drawings. In response, Applicants have submitted herewith drawings that have been amended based on the objection recited at pg. 2 of the November 18, 2005 Office Action. Withdrawal of this objection is in order.

Claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,218,790 ("*Jansa*"), while dependent claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Jansa*. In addition, dependent claims 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Jansa* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,641,294 ("*Lefebvre*").

Applicants note that item 6 of the Office Action does not specifically recite that claims 14 and 15 are unpatentable over the combination of *Jansa* and *Lefebvre*. However, both *Jansa* and *Lefebvre* have been discussed by the Examiner in rejecting claims 14 and 15. Accordingly,

Applicants will address the rejection of these claims based on the combination of *Jansa* and *Lefebvre*.

Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's rejections and the comments provided in support thereof. For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that all claims presented for examination in the present application are patentable over the cited references, and request reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action.

**Amendments Addressing Section 112 Issues and Formalities**

In the November 18, 2005 Office Action, the Drawings were objected to based on a failure to include descriptive text in FIGS. 1, 2, 6 and 9. According to the Examiner, "in figures 1-2, 6, and 9, the blocks should be labeled, e.g., block 2 in figure 1 should be labeled ---DRIVE CIRCUIT---; block 70 should be ---EVALUATION CIRCUIT---". In response to these objections, Applicants have amended FIGS. 1, 2, 4, 6 and 9 in a manner which is believed to be self-explanatory. Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is deemed appropriate.

**Patentability of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Independent claim 1 includes the limitation "wherein said code is detectable by an evaluation circuit which is integrated in the circuit arrangement". *Jansa* fails to teach or suggest this limitation.

The Examiner contends (see pg. 5 of the Office Action) that:

> The term "**integrated**" reading broadly can be interpreted as being "**unified**". Thus, clearly all elements in the Jansa and Lefebvre references are being brought together though [sic] either the physical connections or by circuit operation. Evaluation circuit 18 is clearly being unified in the circuit arrangement. [Emphasis Added]

Applicants respectfully assert that the term "integrated", as used in the claims, must be construed to define that the evaluation circuit forms a part of the circuit arrangement comprising LED components. That is, the claimed evaluation circuit is located in (within) the LED arrangement, as depicted in Fig. 6 of the specification. The Applicants' specification clearly requires this construction of the term, as contrasted with the Examiner's contention that the term "integrated" can be more broadly understood as "unified". Thus, within the context of the claimed invention, it is fundamentally improper to conclude that this expressly claimed feature can be interpreted as "being unified" in the sense disclosed in *Jansa*.

*Jansa* discloses a device wherein the LED and its connection leads are separated from the evaluation circuit and the drive circuit. *Jansa* (col. 3, lines 61-63) states, "a separating line **9** (shown by dashed lines) runs along a connection element **2** (shown only schematically) which has six contact elements **3-8**". *Jansa* (col. 3, line 63 thru col. 4, line 2) further states that "together with the contact elements **3-8** arranged inside the connection elements **2**, which is designed as a male connector, the light-emitting diode **1** forms a physical unit which is arranged such that it can be mechanically separated from the remaining components along the separating line **9**, which symbolizes a plug connection". *Jansa* thus teaches an arrangement in which separate elements, i.e. (a) the light emitting diode, and (b) the evaluation circuit (along with the remaining components), are separated but connected to each other by a plug connector. *Jansa* thus teaches that the evaluation circuit is separated from the LED circuit by a plug connection.

In contrast, a clear distinction is made in the specification of the present application between an embodiment in which the evaluation circuit is separated from the circuit arrangement comprising LED components (see paragraph [0019]), and another embodiment in which the evaluation circuit is integrated in (i.e. located within) the circuit arrangement comprising LED components (see paragraph [0021]). A broad interpretation of the word "integrated" to

encompass the Examiner's suggested meaning of "unified by any electrical or physical connection between these components" is improper, because such an interpretation would simply ignore and discard the difference between these two embodiments, in each of which an electrical connection must in any event be located between the evaluation circuit and the claimed circuit arrangement.

Further evidence of the clear intention of the specification to differentiate between embodiments in which the evaluation unit is either integrated in (on the one hand), or separated from (on the other), the circuit arrangement comprising LED components – and thereby limit the intended meaning of the term "integrated" in the claims – is present in paragraph [0066] of the originally filed specification that describes Fig. 6. There, the specification instructs that "the exemplary embodiment shown in figure 6 differs from that described in conjunction with figure 4 in particular by the fact that an evaluation circuit 73 is not integrated in the drive circuit 21, but rather in the LED module 1". A plug connection is located between the drive circuit 21 and the evaluation circuit 73 in the embodiment of Fig. 6, just as in *Jansa* the LED and the evaluation circuit are separated but electrically connected by a plug connector. Within the context and meaning of the claimed invention, therefore, these components in the Fig. 6 embodiment are not regarded as being "integrated".

Moreover, an analysis such as that suggested by the Examiner, in which the evaluation circuit and the LED circuit described by *Jansa* (which are connected by a plug) are deemed "integrated" within the meaning of claim 1, would require that the arrangement of Fig. 6 of the instant application likewise be deemed "integrated". But Applicants' specification expressly instructs that these elements in Fig. 6 are not "integrated" (see paragraph [0066]). Thus, the Examiner's overly broad interpretation of the claim term "integrated" is contrary to the meaning of that term as described and defined in Applicants' specification. In actuality, the circuit

disclosed in *Jansa* cannot meet the claim 1 limitation that "said code is detectable by an evaluation circuit which is integrated in the circuit arrangement", when the term "integrated" is properly construed in accordance with Applicants' disclosure.

In view of the foregoing, independent claim 1 is deemed patentable over *Jansa* and, accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C §102 are requested, and early notice to this effect is in order.

**Patentability of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

*Jansa* also fails to render the recitations of independent claim 1 obvious, and thus unpatentable. More specifically, it would not be obvious to integrate the evaluation circuit into the electronic circuit arrangement, as claimed, based on that which is taught by *Jansa*. For example, *Jansa* (col. 3, line 63 thru col. 4 line 2) teaches that the LED 1 and the contact elements 3-8 form a physical unit that is mechanically separated from the remaining components, i.e. the evaluation circuit, by a plug connection 2. This separation of the physical unit formed by the LED and the contact elements from the evaluation circuit is emphasized by the separating line 9 shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 of *Jansa*. A person of ordinary level of skill in the art would not be motivated to integrate the evaluation circuit into the electronic circuit arrangement based on the teachings of *Jansa*, since *Jansa* (col. 1, line 59 thru col. 2, line 4) teaches that it is preferable to exclude components, i.e. a single series resistor, from within the LED because doing so would cause a change in the dimensions of the LED structure. Consequently, *Jansa* teaches away from integrating the evaluation circuit in the electronic circuit, as Applicants recite in independent claim 1.

Integration of the evaluation circuit in the electronic circuit arrangement in accordance with the present invention advantageously eliminates the need to connect the evaluation circuit to

the electronic circuit arrangement by connector elements, e.g. a plug element. Eliminating this connector requirement is particularly advantageous when the claimed circuit arrangement is for use in a vehicle, because the integrity of a plug connection may be affected by mechanical vibrations (see, for example, pgs. 2-3, paragraph [0008] of the originally filed specification). Furthermore, the claimed electronic circuit arrangement can advantageously be supplied as a complete module, without the need for an external evaluation circuit. *Jansa* fails to teach or suggest such advantages as are associated with the invention recited in independent claim 1. *Jansa* therefore fails to render independent claim 1 obvious for at least these reasons.

With aspect to dependent claims 14 and 15, the Examiner cites *Lefebvre* in an effort to cure the shortcomings of *Jansa*. The combination of *Jansa* and *Lefebvre,* however, fails to achieve the claimed invention because *Lefebvre* also fails to teach or suggest, at least, that "said code is detectable by an evaluation circuit which is integrated in [a] circuit arrangement," as recited in independent claim 1. *Lefebvre* teaches nothing more than a series of LED chips that are mounted on an elongated housing. Applicants therefore assert that dependent claims 14 and 15 are also patentable over the cited references, when applied individually or in combination, based on their dependency from claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

**Dependent Claims**

In view of the patentability of independent claim 1, for at least the reasons presented above, each of dependent claims 2-18 is likewise deemed patentable over the prior art. Each of these dependent claims also includes features which serve to still further distinguish the claimed invention over the cited art.

**Conclusion**

Based on all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in full and proper condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable action to this effect, and early passage of the application to issue, are once more solicited.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to facilitate a prompt resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By _____

Lance J. Lieberman
Reg. No. 28437
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: November 7, 2006